

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 15 2006

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 5 and 7 have been amended, claim 15 has been canceled, and claim 16 has been added. Claims 1, 2, 5, 7 and 16 remain in the application.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Nasu in view of Antonious. The Examiner has taken the position that it is obvious to have an undercut as taught by Antonious in the putter head of Nasu.

In the currently amended version of claim 1, the limitations regarding the cutouts in the heel and toe regions have been deleted while limitations regarding the top surface and the sole of the club head body have been added. In particular, the top surface is defined as having a concave profile with a first radius of curvature and the sole is defined as having a convex profile with a second radius of curvature. As shown in the drawings, the first radius of curvature is greater than the second radius of curvature. The Nasu and Antonious patents do not disclose a top surface and a sole with profiles as now claimed. The shaft is defined as lying at an acute angle (of approximately 75 degrees as shown in the drawings) to a horizontal reference. As seen in Fig. 1b, an upper corner of the heel region is at a lower elevation from the horizontal reference than an upper corner of the toe region when the club head body is in a first position where the heel region is closer to the horizontal reference than the toe region. The upper corners of the heel and toe regions are at the same elevation from the horizontal reference when the club head body is in a second position where the toe region is closer to the horizontal reference than the heel region so that a straight line connecting the upper corners of the heel and toe regions is generally parallel to the horizontal reference thereby making the top surface of the club head body appear to be level. The Nasu and Antonious patents do not disclose a club head body with these limitations.

Therefore, the currently amended version of claim 1 defines an invention which is not obvious over any combination of Nasu and Autonious.

New claim 16 is supported by the drawings which show in Fig. 5 an angle of approximately 75 degrees between the longitudinal axis 502 of the shaft 104 and the horizontal reference 114. No new matter is introduced.

In view of the preceding remarks, applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 2, 5, 7 and 16.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 8-15-06



Darrell F. Marquette
Reg. No. 28,560